"UNION FOR THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM!"

LETTER OF HON. L. D. CAMPBELL, OF OHIO,

TO THE

HON. DANIEL R. TILDEN,

AS TO

THE PROPER MEANS OF SECURING FREEDOM TO FREE TERRITORIES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, July 8, 1850.

Hon. Daniel R. Tilden:

SIR: My letter to you was in no degree the emanation of an unkind disposition towards you, or your political associates, who might, in the honest discharge of duty, see proper to dissent from the views it expressed. It was written as I now write, without conference with any one; and as I had authorized you to publish it, a friend to whom I read it, requested a copy for publication, and I granted it without presuming for a moment that I would thereby offend you. As the feelings which prompted it, and the expressions which it contained, were alike fraternal in their character, it has, in some degree, surprised those who feel an anxiety for the success of the great principles adverted to, that you, and the press which is *your organ* of communication, instead of controverting any of my positions, have seen proper to adopt sneering expressions, which to dispassionate and unprejudiced minds cannot but be regarded as ungenerous in matter, discourteous in manner, and petulant in spirit.

I have read your reply, and the accompanying remarks of your organ, (*Standard.*) and the comments of other papers, which I presume you approve, and which therefore to some extent I shall notice. I am charged directly with "weakness," "inconsistency," "caving in"—as being the "mouth-piece, for considerations," to communicate a "letter concocted at Washington" by others, "to seduce the Free Soilers" from the path of duty, the result of which will be to bring upon myself "*suspicion, if* not *contempt.*" &c. Were I disposed, in so important a crisis in public affairs as the present, to *let myself down* to a mere personal controversy with any one, I might be found competent, if not willing, to defend myself with similar weapons; but as I have, I trust, a nobler and higher purpose than mere personal triumph, and a self-respect that recoils from such a contest, without accepting the invitation which seems to be tendered, to seek laurels in such a field, I at once submit to the judgment of the candid reader, who has observed the *spirit* by which our respective communications have been characterized, those portions of your letter which might be regarded as containing *ungenerous charges*, if not *contemptible insinuations.*

I feel an aversion to protracted newspaper controversies, and entertained no suspicion that I was about to involve myself in one with you, or that my letter contained a single remark that would justify the attempts made by yourself and others to place me in a false position before the country. Indulging the hope, that in due season we may have the pleasure of meeting in our proper persons, to discuss the relative merits of our respective plans of political action, I shall for the present content myself with such observations as may truly develope the difference in the positions we assume.

It is necessary to recur to my former letter to ascertain the points, if any, upon which we take issue. I asserted certain *facts and circumstances*, upon which my suggestions were predicated. They were:

1*st. That as a majority of the United States Senate are opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, no Territorial bill containing a positive prohibition of slavery can become a law during the existence of the present Congress.*

2*d. That the South, without distinction of party, had organized and united to a man, in both branches of Congress, in opposition to the Proviso, and had already taken measures to secure a similar union in the next Congress.*

I believe this is known and admitted to be the condition of things here, by every member of Congress; and it is somewhat amazing that you, who claim to be so self-sacrificing, and so disinterestedly the friend and advocate of the Rights of Man, should, with so much violence and bitterness of feeling, *oppose "a union of the friends of freedom in the North."* Knowing as I did, that these facts were well known here, I ventured to make the following suggestions:

1*st.* That the present duty of the friends of the Wilmot Proviso *in Congress*, was to procure the unconditional and immediate admission of California as a State, and to prevent the passage of any compromise Territorial law which did not expressly prohibit slavery, on which Southern members and Northern doughfaces might agree, until the people of the North should be able to make such changes in their representation in both branches of Congress as would insure the passage of a Territorial law embracing the Proviso; or until the remaining Territories should, as California had done, and as New Mexico has since done, form State Constitutions, excluding slavery.

2*d.* That, in view of the condition of the South on this subject, a longer continuance of divisions among those in the North who opposed the extension of slavery would prove disastrous to the cause, and that the dictates of patriotism called upon them to unite in securing the election of those who were *reliable friends of the Wilmot Proviso, and of securing freedom to Territories now free.*

Now, sir, if you had either denied the existence of the facts stated, or had attempted to show by clear and direct argument that such *union* would be *adverse* to Freedom, those who are *sincere friends* of that sacred cause, and who desire to pursue such a course as would practically promote it most effectually, would readily have

BUELL & BLANCHARD, Printers.

perceived the propriety of your motives and the patriotism of your conduct. But instead of either admitting or denying them in a manly and frank manner, an attempt is made to weaken their force by a personal attack upon *my motives*—by an apparent effort to excite an unjust prejudice against others—by an effort to arouse the feelings of mere *partisan animosity* towards those whom *you know* are as devoted friends of human rights as yourself. Whatever may be *your* opinion, and the effect of *your* letter upon the honest masses, allow me to say, that the force of the facts I have stated and of the recommendation of union in the North that I have made, is freely admitted by every true Free-Soiler in Congress.

You represent me as recommending a union with the Taylor Whigs *alone*. Could I suppose that you read my letter carelessly, the misrepresentation in this respect would be overlooked. I frankly admitted my sympathy with the Whigs of Ohio, and gave as my reasons, their uniform opposition to the increase of Slavery and the Slave power—facts which your letter neither controverts nor weakens; yet I expressly declared that I believed there were many Democrats in Ohio, whose hearts were against the extension of slavery. I said, in the close, that the question of securing Freedom to the Territories was with me, "*paramount to all the former party tests*," from which the *fair* inference to be drawn was, that I would, until the question is settled, unite with others in the support of a Democrat who was *sound* and *reliable* upon it, in preference to a Whig who would consent that any portion of Territory now free should in any event be made subject to the curse of Slavery! I ask, then, that the candid reader and the honest man shall decide what degree of fairness or common honesty is to be found in the efforts which have been made to represent me to the country as a *doughface*.

Again you make it my duty, however unpleasant, to expose the unfairness of another misrepresentation, which I would hope was unintentional on your part. You tell me that I have adopted as a *principle* by which my action is to be controlled, the "non-action" recommendation of General Taylor, which you declare to be identical with the "*non-intervention*" policy of General Cass. It is not for me to say, entertaining the personal respect I do for you, what it is that obscures *your mental vision*, but most men of ordinary capacities, who are not somewhat "blinded" by partisan prejudice, would see this important difference, that General Taylor *admits* the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories, whilst General Cass *denies* it—that General Taylor would *approve* the Wilmot Proviso, if enacted by Congress, whilst General Cass would *veto* it!—a difference of some importance.

On the subject of General Taylor's action in the event of the passage of the Proviso, you say:

"But as the Proviso will never be submitted for Executive action, the pertinency of your remarks are not readily perceived."

To show the "pertinency of the remarks," as well as to give you important information, which you do not appear yet to have learned, allow me to say, that the term of the present Congress expires on the 4th of March, 1851, and that of the President on the 4th of March, 1853! With this instruction you may "readily perceive" that by union and harmony in the North, the next Congress might be so renovated as to secure the passage of the Proviso; in which event, one would *suppose*, it would "be submitted for Executive action."

You have made the grave charge against me, of adopting the Cass doctrine of "*non-intervention*," and of proving recreant to the cause of Freedom! when you knew that I prepared the Proviso resolution, which you approved in committee, and which was unanimously adopted by the Ohio Whig State Convention of January, 1848—when you knew that at the National Convention, previous to offering your resolution on the same subject, you conferred with me, I approved it, and urged its adoption by that body—when you knew that I had uniformly advocated it on the stump—when you knew that in the canvass of 1848 the only reason why I would not join the Whig party, of which I was always a member, in supporting General Taylor, was that he had then given no positive assurance that he would not veto it—when you knew that during this session of Congress I had voted for Mr. Root's resolution instructing the Committee on Territories to report a bill for the organization of New Mexico, &c., embracing it—when you knew that, although a new member of this body, I was among the first to speak, in no half-way terms, in favor of its passage—when you knew, or might have known, that I have been and am still daily using my feeble influence to procure its passage through this House, regardless of its fate elsewhere—and when you knew, or might have known, that for these reasons I am stigmatized by members, here not as a "doughface," but as an "ultra uncompromising Free-Soiler," and by the *Daily Union*, the Democratic organ, as a "rank Abolitionist!" I leave it to others to determine *what it is you do*, when with *such knowledge* you deliberately publish *such representations!* My respect for myself, as well as for you, prevents me from expressing my own opinion.

I will not say that I erred in giving you credit for *honesty of purpose*. That would be discourteous, if not offensive. But I must be permitted to say, that I might have mistaken the character of your mind when I regarded it as capable of correct and just discriminations. The *intelligent and unprejudiced reader* of my communication to you could not fail to perceive at once that I refused to adopt "non-action" as a *permanent principle*, by which we should be controlled, but merely presented reasons to show that *under existing circumstances* "non-action" would be better for the cause of Freedom than the passage of a "compromise law" for the Territories, which was silent on the subject of Slavery, and that the fruits of "non-action" were the best results the most sanguine Free-Soiler here now expected from the Congress, after all the delays and expenditure of time and money over the question. This was my position, and I challenge you to show, by any facts or arguments, that such is not the condition of things here, or to name a single Free-Soil member of Congress who does not admit it. I contended that the fruits of "non-action" were more beneficial to Freedom than those of *wrong action*—that is all; yet because I would prefer the consequences of *doing nothing* to those of *doing evil*, you with great magnanimity repudiate me as a *doughface!* Until the Wilmot Proviso can be passed in Congress, I know of no bet

plan to secure Freedom to the Territories than the President's. Do you know a better one? If you do, make it known, and I will adopt and support it.

Suppose that you were a member of Congress, my dear sir, and should see great danger that a bill with the popular title of "compromise" would be passed, which would give the right, which does not exist, to take Slavery into Territories now free. You would vote to insert the Wilmot Proviso. So will I. You would vote against the passage of a law for the Territories which does not exclude Slavery. So will I. If the Proviso failed in the Senate, (as it has done and will do,) and a law without it failed by the opposition of your vote, we should have *no law at all*—the fruits of non-action, produced partly by your vote—as the best thing which, as a Free-Soil man, you could effect *under the existing circumstances.* And if you saw, as I see, the union of the South, and the dangerous divisions among the friends of Freedom in the North, which threaten the complete overthrow of the cause *in the next Congress,* I apprehend (believing you *sincere* in your professions) you would write and speak as I have done, and will do, in favor of a "union of the friends of Freedom for the sake of Freedom!" If, then, you would do this under *such circumstances*, why have you not the frankness to recommend such a course, and to say that I am not a "doughface," or to admit that you are one yourself, and that you *have* "as a sow returned from the wash to the wallow!" If you would not so act, I beseech you to *take your light from under the bushel*, and point out some better means of securing and protecting Human Rights. Sir, let me say, in candor, that if you could not see the distinction I made, you are entitled to commiseration; but if, seeing it, you wilfully seek to misrepresent me, your course is calculated to change the feelings of sincere respect, which I entertain, to those of the *most profound contempt!*

I have every reason to believe that the great mass of those who have been connected with the Free-Soil organization in Ohio are men of true and disinterested patriotism and tried integrity; that it is the strongest desire of their hearts, by their political and social action, to defend and protect the principles of Freedom, and to prevent the spread of Slavery. But I am told, sir, that there are a *few* partisans who are not actuated solely by the impulses of this generous philanthropy; that the system of these few persons is, so to operate upon the mere prejudices of the masses, as to keep up organizations for the sole purpose of securing a balance of power that will give them some capital upon which to trade and traffic with either or both of the old parties, for the little offices which are to be distributed. It is not for me to say, nor will I say, that this is true, or that you have given any evidence that you are of this class; but, as I write frankly and freely, you will permit me to suggest, in the kindest spirit and with all due respect, that I have heard *others* intimate that, in refusing to bear the Free-Soil flag through Ohio, in the present Gubernatorial campaign, for the sake of *the cause*, when *defeat* was probable, and at the same time accepting the post of *Collector of Tolls on the Canal*, which, it is said, was secured for you by the removal of your former friend, patron, and supporter, *through Democratic influences*, your motives were not wholly disinterested; that your philanthropy for the poor slave was not altogether free from the influence of the "almighty dollar;" and that the well-known motto of your co-laborer and associate, that "*a bird in hand is worth two in the bush*," was, about that time, as much impressed on your mind as the immortal principle alleged in the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are born free and equal!" Knowing nothing about the facts, I make no charges on this point; but if such be the facts, insinuations that the political course of *others* is controlled by improper "*considerations*," are certainly unwise. If you are so averse to "*entangling alliances*," when necessary to secure the *principle*, your suggestions might have greater weight among true-hearted Free-Soilers, if accompanied by *practical demonstrations*, that you also abjured them when your *interest* was involved.

You say that I have sunk my consistency and influence in the Taylor Whig party of Ohio, and that it is opposed to the Wilmot Proviso. Upon this point I must also be indulged in a few remarks. The difference here between us seems to be this: I cannot condemn those who honestly oppose the further extension of Slavery, and who may differ with me as to the best means of accomplishing the object; whilst you denounce all of us as *unsound* who, though advocating the same principles you profess, cannot see how *your* plan of *dividing the friends of Freedom, that its opponents may secure the power*, is to prevent the progress of Slavery! Sir, you may, with a kind of "I am holier than thou" expression, read me lectures upon consistency and political propriety, but permit me to suspect that you draw too heavily upon the credulity of the Anti-Slavery men of Ohio, if you presume that their honesty and common sense will not discover the fallacy of your plan. They will join you in no such work of destruction, at such a time as this, *when every vote should be so cast as to make its mark in favor of Freedom.* Speaking for myself, I have already said, that I regard the proposition to extend Slavery, as "*paramount to all other questions of the day*," and I shall act and vote in accordance with this view, in a way to make my vote *count* for Freedom; and I very much mistake the patriotism of the rank and file Free-Soilers of Ohio if they do not act in accordance with the view taken by Horace Mann, whose devotion to their principles is quite as favorably understood throughout the whole country as yours, who says: "*I certainly would not throw away my vote on a man whom I might consider the best of three candidates, when the certain consequence would be that the worst of them would be elected.*"

Upon what "platform" is the proposed "union" to be formed? I would say upon this: 1st. *That Congress should pass the Proviso if it can;* 2d. *If it cannot, it should prevent the passage of any law which does not expressly prohibit Slavery, and leave the Territories as they are, with their present exclusion of that institution, until the Proviso can be passed by Congress, or adopted by the People in their State Constitutions.* This is broad enough for every Free Soiler, and he is not a true friend to the cause, in my opinion, who refuses to come upon it, and yet countenances dissensions and divisions in the North, without suggesting a better one.

In my former letter I adverted to the consistency of the Whig party of Ohio in its adherence to the Anti-Slavery positions, and to the fact that

the Democratic party has stood by Southern interests. There are exceptions in both parties—some Whigs who oppose the Proviso, and some Democrats who are in favor of it. I speak of the masses, and of the sentiments declared in their State Conventions. So long, then, as, in my judgment, I can *most successfully promote the cause of Freedom* by acting with the Whigs of Ohio, there will I be found, *but no longer.* When that party repudiates its former advocacy of "Free Soil principles," I will repudiate it, and labor with whatever party, in whatever sphere, my efforts promise the greatest success.

The chief offence which you charge on the Whigs of Ohio is, that in 1848 they endeavored to elect General Taylor, and did not join you in supporting Mr. Van Buren. Without undertaking to decide upon the justice of this charge, I cannot perceive the force of the objection when I remember that it has been admitted by intelligent Free-Soilers who advocated Mr. Van Buren, that one great purpose in selecting him as their candidate was, to take enough Democrats in New York and Pennsylvania from General Cass to give those States to General Taylor, and thus *secure his election.* If this be true, (and I have some reason to believe it,) the object was a common one. At all events, it seems that "divide and conquer," proved the successful rule of action. The Van Buren men "*divided*" the Democracy in those States, whilst the Taylor men "*conquered*" it; and whatever may have been the effect *intended*, every intelligent politician must know that it was the Free-Soil movement which took from the Democracy Pennsylvania and New York, gave them to General Taylor, and secured his election over General Cass. The difference is simply this, that the Free-Soilers in those States, avowing themselves against an extension of Slavery, *did indirectly elect General Taylor*, whilst the Taylor Whigs in Ohio, avowing themselves for Free-Soil measures, *endeavored to elect him by a direct vote!* These being the facts, and the defeat of General Cass, and the consequent election of General Taylor, being the common purpose, and having been accomplished by your joint action, although by different means, it seems to me that, as his Administration is now denounced by Southern men as a "*Free-Soil concern*," and has given the Slave influence *no advantages* over Free Soil, further crimination and recrimination is unprofitable, if not unjust. The same reasons ought to modify, somewhat, the asperity of those Taylor Whigs who denounce with so much bitterness the action of Free-Soilers.

All of us well know that in 1848 General Taylor's opinion upon the Proviso was not known, whilst Mr. Van Buren's official record was not very full of evidences of devotion to Free-Soil measures. Aside, then, from the view just presented, as between the two, the choice was between taking a man, without knowing positively what he would do, and one whose former life was not a *sure guaranty* of fidelity to the cause. Admitting, as I do, that in their desire to secure the success of the *principles*, the friends of each were sincere, I cannot find reason to join anybody in the denunciation of either.

But before either you or I raise a cry of condemnation against either the Taylor Whigs of Ohio or against the Van Buren men, should we not, if just men, examine fully *our own acts*, and ascertain what would now have been our position and our responsibilities, *had we, in June*, 1848, *succeeded in accomplishing our purposes.*

You allude to the Philadelphia, or, as you desire to designate it, the "Slaughter-house" Convention. I remember it well, and long will it be before I forget what WE would have done if we had had the power. *We would have nominated Henry Clay.* I have said, and say again, that I never have approved, and never will approve, the means resorted to to control the action of that body, nor its silence upon the great questions involved in the canvass. I will never take back one word of my description of it, to which you so flatteringly allude. You and I were Wilmot Proviso delegates, and voted for General Scott; yet neither of us can forget how ardently we labored to produce such an union on Mr. Clay as would defeat the nomination of General Taylor! Our votes were both ready to be cast for Mr. Clay whenever they could effect his nomination. If we had succeeded, we would both have labored for his election with a zeal not surpassed by that of any Taylor man in Ohio. I am not arrogating too much, perhaps, when I claim that our purposes were sincere and patriotic. Our judgments then told us that Mr. Clay was the most reliable on the Slavery Question, of the two. But, sir, imagine that with the *new lights* before us, we should have been called on to nominate a candidate in June, 1850—our choice confined to General Taylor and Henry Clay. The former gives a pledge that he will not veto the action of Congress if it excludes Slavery from the Territories; that he will recommend the admission of California as a State, with a Constitution embracing the principle of the Ordinance of 1787 excluding Slavery, and "non-action" as to the Territories, until their people (who are known to be opposed to that institution) shall form State Constitutions for themselves. On the other hand, Mr. Clay declares his policy to be a "Compromise" bill based upon the Cass doctrine of "non-intervention," *improved* by an express provision that the people, through their Territorial Legislature, shall not exclude Slavery by law—the payment to Texas of ——— millions of dollars for territory to which she has no title, together with a law, under which a loafer in New Orleans could force from his family and his home in Ohio a free colored man, without *a trial by jury!* Which of the two would you prefer? I present this view to you to show what might have been the result of our efforts, if successful—to show you to what ends *Executive influences* would have been wielded, had we nominated, and the Free-Soil Whigs of Ohio elected, *our* favorite in 1848—*Henry Clay!* You have made the grand discovery that "breathing the free air of Ohio" has a wonderful effect upon a man's patriotism, as well as his political sagacity. You seem to think, too, that you have been more blessed in this way, for the last six months, than I. Let me ask you, then, whether you will not frankly join with me in confessing that if *we* had succeeded with Mr. Clay, by our votes as delegates in the Slaughter-house Convention, we would not have done infinitely more harm to the cause of Freedom, as we understand it, than the Whigs and Free-Soilers have done by their election of General Taylor? This being our position, and these the *developments of time*, allow me most humbly to suggest, that we have not any

very extraordinary right to claim a greater degree of political foresight than those you complain of, and that a proper delicacy on our part should induce us to be sparing in our condemnation of those who, to say the least of it, have not done as much evil as we should have done if we could.

There may be something in "breathing that free air" at the "collector's office, Lock No. 4," which enables you to understand men and movements here better than I do; but you will nevertheless pardon me for saying that you could find no Free-Soiler here who will not declare, by his votes and otherwise, that he regards the policy of General Taylor as infinitely more beneficial to Free-Soil measures than that either of Mr. Clay or General Cass, and General Taylor as a much safer man for the North than either of them.

Your influence may have the effect to "seduce some honest Free-Soil men" from their true duty in this crisis; but the day is not far distant when the effects of these Northern divisions which you desire to keep up, and which I propose should be healed, will be sorely felt. When the South, united, shall come into the next Congress, and Northern dissensions shall have sent their doughfaces here to aid them—when the black flag of slavery shall have been carried by the power of compromise and of law over territory that has hitherto been free—you may feel that mere *party* divisions, not founded on a difference of *principle*, but in *name* merely, were unwise. I have for the present discharged my duty, and solemnly sounded the alarm, giving my humble views, without desiring to dictate to others.

As it is my purpose to publish the contents of this letter to my constituents, I wish my positions to be distinctly understood:

I. As the question of slavery involves a great moral principle, I believe its importance paramount to all others, and I shall vote and act upon it in accordance with this opinion, without regard to my former associations or to the character of present or future political organizations, when they come in conflict with my own opinion of right.

II. I believe the Wilmot Proviso to be constitutional and expedient, and I will use my vote and all fair and honorable means to procure its passage, regardless of the threats of dissolution from one quarter of the Union, or of the unfounded expressions of fear from the other. I will aid in its passage through the House of Representatives, as an expression of public sentiment, even if certain of its defeat in the Senate.

III. Until the Proviso can be applied to the Territories of the United States by Congress, I regard "non-action" as more acceptable than any "compromise" law for the Territories, which is silent on the subject of slavery. Hence, I will oppose any such law, though the result of Congressional action may be the same to the Territories as if there had been *no action* at all.

IV. As slavery is a State institution, I am opposed to all laws or systems from which it may derive the support of the General Government, yet I am equally opposed to any attempt to abolish the institution in the States where it exists under the Constitution, without the consent of the people of those States.

V. Although willing to give to the slaveholding States any fair law under their constitutional right in regard to "fugitives from labor," yet I will oppose the passage of Mr. Clay's fugitive bill, or any other which does not secure to the alleged fugitive the *right of trial by jury*, wherever he may be arrested as such, if he claims to be a *free man!*

VI. Although I believe that the *national* character of both the Whig and Democratic parties is, or will be, partially if not wholly destroyed, until these questions are settled; yet as the *Whig party of Ohio* has uniformly declared the principles of the Ordinance of 1787 in relation to slavery as a tenet of its faith, and the Democratic party has uniformly repudiated it, I regard it as the duty of the friends of Freedom to sustain the *former* in preference to the *latter*, so long as it remains true to the principles it has professed, and as circumstances shall clearly indicate that *one or the other of these parties must have the political power of the State.* The importance of a combination of the true friends of Freedom, by whatever *party name* they may have been called, is made manifest by the union of both parties in the South, which shows that the *crisis* is upon us.

VII. The people of California and New Mexico having adopted State Constitutions embracing the principle of the Ordinance of 1787, I am in favor of their immediate admission into the Union, disconnected from any other measure.

VIII. I will sustain all constitutional measures of the Executive to promote what I have always regarded the policy of the Whig party of Ohio, and especially all his efforts to prevent the State of Texas from taking forcible possession of any portion of the territory in dispute between that State and New Mexico.

These contain substantially the sentiments I have uniformly entertained, and, as I believe, consistently advocated, with some zeal, on all proper occasions and in all proper ways, as my votes and published addresses will prove. I have no *newborn* love for them like that of those who, having supported the annexation of Texas, the Mexican war, and kindred measures, would now have the public consider me as "*unsound.*"

For maintaining these positions I am represented here by Southern men as an "ultra Free-Soiler," and by the "Daily Union," the organ of the Democratic party, as an "ardent advocate of Abolitionism, Wilmot-Provisoism, and Free-Soilism," and as one who probably "threw away his vote on Birney, Giddings, or *Frederick Douglas*," and at the same time am represented at home, by yourself and by papers professing to be advocates of "Free Soil," as a "doughface!" I have endured such things, and seen such inconsistencies before, and if there are those who have not yet learned that they have no terrors for me, let them know it now. Whenever and wherever my judgment points me to a duty I should perform, that duty, if in the range of my power, shall be discharged without fear as to consequences. In this crisis, "*I tread no backward step!*" I shall now and hereafter recommend to all men, in Ohio and elsewhere, who are truly opposed to an increase of the slave power, "Union and Harmony, for the sake of Freedom," regardless alike of the assaults of such Free-Soilers (if there are such) as may regard the success of mere party organization as more important than the *triumph* of Freedom, and of faint-hearted Whigs (if there are such) on the one side, and the taunts of whining demagogues and Democratic doughfaces on the

other. If I am rewarded with a continuation of ungenerous insinuations from yourself, or malignant assaults from the party press, these will be no new wrongs to me, and I shall at least, in the darkest hour of the storm, derive those indescribable enjoyments which an approving conscience alone can give, and which the stealthy hand of defamation cannot take from me.

Very truly yours, &c.,

LEWIS D. CAMPBELL.

Since the foregoing letter was written, President Taylor has died. He has been called to answer before a Tribunal that will do him justice. Millard Fillmore is now the President. I shall endeavor to judge his Administration, as I have that of General Taylor, without prejudice, by its fruits. If its acts are such as I can support, I will approve them. If otherwise, I stand ready to oppose it. You will remember that Mr. Fillmore was your first choice for Vice President at the Philadelphia Convention, that you voted for him in all the ballotings, and that Free-Soilers in Ohio, on the Whig side, would willingly have supported him, had he not been connected with the nomination of General Taylor. He is a Northern man, has never bought, sold, nor owned a slave, and has never been connected or associated with Slavery. If his Administration is in favor of the immediate and unconditional admission of California and New Mexico; if the constitutional power of the Executive is used to prevent the aggressions of Texas upon New Mexico; and his influence is not wielded to control legislation—should not you, who aided to place him in this position, give him your support?

L. D. C.

APPENDIX.

The following correspondence will show that several Senators and Representatives, who have been regarded as *uncompromising opponents to the extension of Slavery*, entertain views similar to those expressed in the letter to Mr. Tilden.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, Tuesday, July 2, 1850.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of asking you to state whether the following propositions are not, in your opinion, correct:

1. That the Wilmot Proviso cannot pass the United States Senate, as it is at present constituted.

2. That the true policy of the friends of Freedom in Congress, under existing circumstances, is to procure the unconditional and immediate admission of California as a free State, and to prevent the passage of any law for territorial organizations, which does not contain a positive prohibition of Slavery, until there is power in both branches of Congress to pass the Wilmot Proviso, or until the people of the Territories shall form State Constitutions.

3. That, now that the power of the South is brought into Congress, united against the restriction of Slavery, it is the solemn duty of all parties in the North, who are opposed to its extension, to unite in supporting candidates who are reliable friends of the Wilmot Proviso, as the restriction of Slavery to its present limits is a measure paramount in importance to any and all the questions which have hitherto divided parties.

For assuming these positions, I have been denounced by a paper calling itself "*Free Soil*," as "*a traitor to the cause of Freedom*," and I have to ask you the favor of an immediate reply for publication.

Very truly, yours, &c., L. D. CAMPBELL.

WASHINGTON, *July* 2, 1850.

Hon. L D. Campbell:

SIR: I received your letter of this date a few moments since, and agreeably to your request I answer it immediately.

You inquire, first, whether the Ordinance of '87 can pass the present Senate in a Territorial bill.

The votes taken on the proposition during the present session answer the question in the negative. I do not suppose there can be any doubt on that point I consider any effort to pass the Proviso through the Senate, as now constituted as hopeless.

As to your second question, I answer: I conceive it to be the duty of Congress to keep the free territory acquired from Mexico in its present condition—that is, with Slavery excluded—and to that end, whenever Congress proceeds to legislate for such Territories, Slavery should be prohibited by positive enactment. I consider it the duty of either branch of Congress to enact the Proviso, although the other branch of Congress might disagree to the measure. As the Senate will not agree to such a bill if the House should pass it, and adhere to its position, the bill would fall, of course, by the disagreement of the two Houses. I conceive it to be the duty of the friends of the Ordinance of '87 to leave the Territories in their present condition, with the laws in force when we received them, rather than organize them without the Proviso. I am strengthened in this position by the recent conduct of California, who has (in default of legislation by Congress) organized a State Government and settled the question of Slavery in the only way in which, under our system, it ever can be *finally* settled, that is, by the authority of a State Constitution. I feel quite sure New Mexico will follow her example. Indeed, we have recent intelligence from Santa Fe which leaves no doubt that a State Government is at this moment formed by the People of New Mexico.

As to your third inquiry, I suppose no one who regards the extension of Slavery to free territory as wrong, can hesitate in ranking that question as paramount in importance to any other. All such should unite in the support of candidates who agree with them on this subject.

I consider it amongst the enormities of which our times are unhappily too fruitful, that you should be charged with being false to the sentiments advocated by the friends of the Proviso in the Northern and Western States. It can be ascribed to nothing but that partisan zeal which, at a certain stage of its madness, renders its subjects blind to the truth.

Yours, truly,

THOS. CORWIN.

WASHINGTON, *July* 6, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR: An apology for my delay in answering your letter of the 2d is due to you, but you are well aware of the manifold engagements which continually oppress me.

I trust that you will excuse me for declining to give categorical answers to the three questions which you have propounded to me. My reason for this course is, that I think the error of the friends of Freedom throughout the United States has consisted chiefly in establishing, or attempting to establish tests, creeds, and platforms, which has resulted seldom in making one comprehensive enough, and exact enough, to secure general assent, and, frequently, in distracting controversies, hindering and delaying the cause that all desired to promote. My own rule of action has been to do all that I rightfully could to promote the cause according to my own judgment, without controversy with others engaged in it, whatever their particular views or associations might be. It will not be difficult to gather from my published sentiments a near coincidence of opinion with those you have advanced. Yet, I would not even seem willing to exact concurrence from others.

But I can truly and safely say, my dear sir, that if you are not entitled to be considered firm, faithful, and devoted to the great cause, I know not who among us is so. The firmness of Free-Soil men of all parties in Congress is most gratifying. I am, with much respect and esteem,

Your friend and humble servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. L. D. Campbell,
House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, July 3, 1850.

DEAR SIR: Agreeably to your request, I make an early reply to the queries contained in your letter of yesterday.

Your first proposition, upon which my opinion is solicited, is, "that the Wilmot Proviso cannot pass the United States Senate, as it is at present constituted." Of this allegation I can entertain no doubt; and since a majority of the Senators have avowed themselves in opposition to the Proviso and have more than once voted against it, I do not see how any person can assert the contrary.

Your second proposition is in accordance with the course of action I have marked out for myself, and is, in my opinion, just and correct. It is the right of California to be immediately admitted as a State, into the Union, and the voice of the country is not doubtful upon the propriety of her

coming in unconditionally and at the earliest possible period. I am anxious to spare no exertions to accomplish this desirable object.

Ought we to oppose every law for Territorial organization, unless it contain a positive prohibition of Slavery? I think we ought to do so. The Mexican laws ought to be sufficient to prohibit Slavery, but they are boldly assailed by the advocates of the extension of Slavery, and are denied to have any efficiency unless sanctioned by a positive enactment of the Proviso by the American Congress. The course of the discussion upon the territorial question, and the positions generally taken by the South, show that the formation of Territorial Governments without a positive prohibition of Slavery will be taken as a triumph on the part of the friends of Slavery, and that thereupon they will demand that the Constitution of the United States protects Slavery in our new acquisitions. Under these circumstances, I propose to myself to vote against any Territorial organization which does not embrace positive exclusion of this institution.

In regard to your only remaining inquiry, I say, briefly, that I consider opposition to the extension of Slavery to be paramount in importance to all other political questions; and that where a combination of the members of the old parties is necessary in order to secure the election to office of friends of the Proviso, I think such combination ought to take place.

Respectfully and truly yours, AMOS TUCK.

Hon. L. D. Campbell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *July* 3, 1850.

Hon. L. D. Campbell:

DEAR SIR: You ask me a series of questions, the first of which is, whether the Wilmot Proviso, (so called,) can pass the United States Senate, as that body is at present constituted;—by which I suppose you mean, during the present Congress, and before any change among its members shall occur.

On the 5th of June last, Mr. Seward moved to amend the Compromise bill, by inserting the Proviso, and the motion was lost by a vote of 33 to 23. On the next day, Mr. Walker moved to amend the bill by prohibiting peon slavery or servitude, and his motion was lost by a vote of 32 to 20. These votes are a fair specimen of many which have been given on the subject. I suppose, therefore, that the Proviso will not pass the Senate, "as at present constituted," without some special interference as sudden as that which happened to Saul on his way to Damascus.

2. I think the true policy of the friends of Freedom, in Congress, is to admit California as a State, during the present session; though I cannot doubt, if she is kept out of the Union by the opposition of Southern gentlemen, it will make her abhor slavery all the more intensely. I would admit California as a State, unconnected with any other subject, unless it should be the congenial one of admitting New Mexico as a State, at the same time. I would vote for no Territorial Government which did not contain a prohibition of slavery;—deeming it to be a far less evil, to be unorganized, and even exposed to Indian depredations, without slavery, than to be organized, with it, or with exposure to it.

3. I think the great question of the continuance of Freedom in the Territories, or the extension of slavery into them, to be paramount to any other question, on which political parties are divided. I ought to add, however that I do not consider this question at all incompatible with, or antagonistic to, many most important questions, in which the economical welfare of the country is involved.

In my opinion, the best course for the friends of Freedom to pursue, under existing circumstances, is to vote for the truest anti extensionist who can be elected. I certainly would not throw away my vote on a man whom I might consider the best of three candidates, when the certain consequence would be the election of the worst. I have observed that those who say they will not take the lesser of two evils, often accept the greatest of three;—their own course being the third.

I regret to hear that you have been "denounced" by any body or party of men in your State, If any man has shown himself, by his votes and acts, to be a truer friend to Freedom than you have, I should be glad to know him. Your only acts, to which, as it seems to me, any man could object, were the few complimentary votes which you gave for me before the House was organized. But I hold these to have been among the highest proofs of your love of Freedom, however disparaging to your judgment in its exercise.

Very truly and sincerely, yours, &c., HORACE MANN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *July* 12, 1850.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of to-day's date.

In reply to the propositions, I have no hesitation in giving an affirmative answer; providing, always, that the candidate is in good standing, and believes in the Federal Government withdrawing at once all its support to slavery.

With great regard, I remain your obedient servant,

CHARLES DURKEE.

Hon. L. D. Campbell, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON *July* 2, 1850.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of this date. I have well considered all your propositions, and very freely answer them *all* in the affirmative.

I had little expected to find you denounced as recreant to Freedom, while the South and the Doughfaces here look upon you as ultra Free-Soil. I consider your position just right. With great respect, your obedient servant,

THADDEUS STEVENS.

Hon. L. D. Campbell, Washington.

Messrs. Hale and Chase of the Senate, and Messrs. Allen, Booth, Giddings, Preston King, Wilmot, and Julian, of the House, were similarly addressed. Messrs. Hale and Allen have not replied. The replies of Messrs. Chase and Booth are withheld, at their request. Mr. King endorses Mr. Wilmot's letter. The replies of Messrs. Wilmot and Julian were published by them at the same time I received them, and therefore need not be republished here.

To prevent a misunderstanding of the views of some of these gentlemen, I addressed to Senator Seward and to Messrs. Wilmot and Julian the following note, hoping to receive from each of them a definite reply, which would not be capable of perversion and misconstruction. The two latter gentlemen do not answer; but I am indebted to Mr. Seward for a distinct reply:

HOUSE OF REPS., *Washington, July* 11, 1850.

SIR: To prevent any misunderstanding of your letter to me, I beg leave most respectfully to inquire whether in your opinion there is any better way to secure Freedom to the Territories acquired from Mexico. so long as all our efforts to pass through Congress a law for their organization embracing the Wilmot Proviso shall fail, than that of the late President, of leaving them without any other law than that which may now be in force.

Very truly yours, &c., L. D. CAMPBELL.

Hon. W. H. Seward, United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, *July* 14, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR: In the speech which I made in the Senate on the 2d instant, I declared my purpose to adhere to the last in the effort to exclude Slavery from the Territories by public enactment, and my purpose, further, if this effort should fail, not to vote for a law organizing the Territories without the Proviso; but to fall back on the action of the Territories themselves, as I had done in the case of California, and as was recommended by the late President of the United States with consummate wisdom. I need scarcely say that I have seen nothing to change these views as the rule of my own action; but I do not even incline to prescribe my own opinion for the adoption of others.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Hon. L D Campbell, House of Representatives.

DEMOCRATIC APPEAL!

The following extracts are taken from the *Daily Union* of Washington city, the organ of the Democratic party, of June 29th, 1850. I recommend them to the deliberate attention of all parties in Ohio.

"THE CURTAIN WITHDRAWN BY AN M. C.

"We find in the *Morgan (Ohio) Herald* of the 20th inst. an important letter from the Hon. Lewis D Campbell, of the House of Representatives. Its author has been in Washington since the commencement of the session, and of course in consultation with the Whig, Abolition, and Free-Soil parties. He has been behind the scenes; and of course he is well qualified to give an account of what is happening there. His letter, therefore, must be considered as an important revelation, not to be passed over lightly. If our space permitted, we would publish it in full; but circumstances compel us to content ourselves with extracts from it.

"It is perhaps known that Mr Campbell is an ardent advocate of abolitionism, Wilmot-Provisoism, and Free-Soilism. He was a delegate to the Philadelphia Convention in 1848, and there offered a resolution declaring that no one should be entitled to the nomination who was not fully pledged to the maintenance of Whig principles, and assented to another declaring, as the sentiment of the Whig party, that slavery should not be extended; and in his lettler he mentions the fact that those resolutions were defeated through the agency of Messrs. Toombs, Stephens, Cabell, Clingman, and others. He also says, in the language of complaint, that General Taylor, whose position on the Wilmot Proviso was unknown, received the nomination of the Slaughter-House Convention. He distrusted General Taylor so far that he would not vote for him. Even Mr. Van Buren's Free-Soilism did not satisfy his urgent longings. The very name of Cass was hateful to him. In short, none of the candidates presented to the people went far enough for him; and we are left in doubt whether he voted at all, or threw his vote away on Birney, Giddings, or Frederick Douglas.

"Such is part first of Mr. Campbell's letter It is clearly for the purpose of showing his deep, fervent, and constant love for Free-Soilism, and his early and unconquerable attachment to the Wilmot Proviso, in order to justify his refusal to vote for General Taylor. * * * *

"Mr. Campbell allndes to the course pursued by Mr. Toombs and those Southern gentlemen above mentioned, who were opposed to anti-slavery pledges from the Whig candidate. He argues, with great force, from that course, that they have become satisfied that they were mistaken as to the position of General Taylor on the slavery question. * * * * * * * * * *

"Such is Mr. Campbell's argument; and it amounts to a direct assertion, from one behind the scenes, that those Southern gentlemen who supported General Taylor on the faith of his two hundred slaves have cheated themselves; and that argument contains a well-merited taunt on the Southern Whig party for its successful effort to elect Taylor and Filmore, without pledges or promises with regad to the slavery question. The Northern Whigs were willing to have the matter understood; but Southern Whigs, knowing well that any expression of opinion by the Philadelphia Convention would be adverse to the constitutional rights of the South, demanded and obtained the priviledge of fighting in the dark. The people of the South were duped, deceived, and betrayed.

"Mr. Campbell's first point is, that the Wilmot Proviso, *eo nomine*, cannot be obtained at the present session.

"This point being assumed, Mr. Campbell has but little difficulty in proving by his other two points that General Taylor's recommendation is the best practicable thing for the friends of the Wilmot Proviso.

"The second point is, that the unconditional admission of California as recommended by the President, with the defeat of territorial bills in accordance with the same plan, will allow the anti-slavery agitation to continue in the non-slaveholding States, so that they may in time send a delegation to Washington which will vote down the South, and fasten the Wilmot Proviso on the statute-book.

"The plan, therefore, of the sympathizers—of the Abolitionists and the Administrationists—is the same: 1. Admit California unconditionally; 2. Defeat any Territorial bill which organizes Territorial Government, which is stripped of the Wilmot Proviso; and, 3. If these Territories should form a State Constitution which interdicts slavery, then receive them with open arms. The only way to defeat this Machiavelian scheme, and save the rights of the South, is to permit Congress itself to organize Territorial Governments which are stripped of the Wilmot Proviso. Will, then, our friends of the South assist in carrying out this notable scheme by voting down the Compromise bill?

"He prays urgently for a union between all the Whig and Wilmot Proviso forces, so that a solid phalanx may be brought to bear against the Democratic party in Ohio, and against all those, in all quarters of the country, who sustain the Senate's Adjustment We present these facts to the people, and to the Representatives of the South, as matters deserving their most serious consideration. The movements in New Mexico have already vindicated a portion of Mr. Campbell's reasoning, and they prove that all his prophecies will soon be absolute facts, unless the slavery question should be speedily adjusted. Mr. Campbell has undoubtedly spoken truths– things not often spoken by men of his persuasion. He has but drawn back the curtain, and exhibited some important revelations to the public eye. Will not the ultra Southerners take warning? Are they as blind as bats, that they do not see these things? Are they as deaf as adders to sounds which stun the ears of all around them? Are they willing to drive their constituents to the abyss which yawns before them? Can they fail to see that they are acting in obedience to the wishes of their worst enemies? that they are but carrying out the plans and projects of the Administration and its allies, the Abolitionists and Free-Soilers? The letter of Mr. Campbell was written before the late news was received from New Mexico. That news makes further delay impossible, if Southern Representatives wish to obtain anything for the Southern people. We therefore again assert, that if the Senate's Adjustment is defeated, the only issue left is the utter exclusion of the South from every foot of territory acquired from New Mexico, or disunion and civil war. The chapter of accidents can present nothing else. Defeat the Compromise, and the future can be read as plain as a printed book. That book will show the two alternatives we have mentioned—the one disunion, the other exclusion of the South from the Territories. Will the South submit to that exclusion? She will not.

"We repeat that yesterday was an important day in the session. It decided the fate of the Missouri Compromise, upon which some of the Southern Senators and Representatives had rallied, and which had been so recently declared the favorite, if not the *sine qua non*, of the Nashville Convention. It is now useless to rely upon it as an available alternative for the adjustment of the controversy. Willing as we were to accept it from various considerations—anxious even to adopt it as a measure to give peace to this distracted land—honest as were its champions in supporting it, we must now cease to look to it as a great pacificator of the Republic. This measure must, therefore, be considered as struck out of the systems of adjustment. and we must look to other alternatives for settling this question. It is evident that the issues are becoming more limited and better defined. The great alternative of the Missouri Compromise being withdrawn from the field, we are circumscribed to a narrow range. We have to choose between the President's miserable, temporizing platform, and the basis of the Committee of Thirteen. In other words thus pressed on the one side by a rejection of the Missouri line, and on the other by the late movement in New Mexico, we have to decide whether the South shall abandon every inch of territory to the non-slaveholders, or whether we shall throw their rights under the shelter of the Compromise of the Senate. The present aspect of the subject cannot be mistaken We must meet it at once boldly in the face. Reject the basis of the Compromise, and the South loses California at once, without the slightest equivalent. Then she will lose every foothold in New Mexico, *unless* we not only reject her as a State, but prevent her new State Constitution, or a Territorial Government formed by herself, like that of Oregon, from operating against the South, with anti-slavery provisions. And there is no other mode of counteracting this inevitable result. but by Congress organizing Territorial Governments for New Mexico and Utah, which shall be restricted in passing any law 'establishing or prohibiting African slavery.' Choose ye between these alternatives. Will the South surrender California without an equivalent? and shall we, rejecting all compromises, as the Missouri Compromise cannot be obtained, cut her off from every inch of Territory which she may be disposed to claim for the settlement of her slaves? We speak plainly upon this subject—not as metaphysicans—not as men who revel in mere abstractions, but as plain, practical men, who judge from the circumstances that are before us, and come to the best conclusions of which the whole case is susceptible. Will the South abandon everything, except an efficient provision for the restriction of her fugitive slaves? or will she call upon Congress to prostrate the Wilmot Proviso, and organize Territorial Governments for New Mexico and Utah, which will throw open these Territories to the fair experiment of the adaptation of slavery to the soil and the climate?"

"FRUITS OF TAYLORISM."

A recent number of the Raleigh (N. C.) Standard contains the following denunciation of the effects of General Taylor's policy upon Free-Soilism and Slavery. Those who have been unprejudiced observers of late events will readily perceive that it contains "more truth than poetry."

"There is room enough for all in California. If that country had been thrown open to slave labor, *slave property would have been at this moment twenty-five per cent. higher in North Carolina*, and we should have stood some chance of realizing our proper and just share of the mineral riches of that remarkable land; but, as it is, *under this Free Soil Administration of General Taylor*, and as the direct result of his instructions and his policy, we are deprived of all this, while foreigners and natives of the free States are reaping all the advantages and profits! And to complete the list of infamous measures against the South, New Mexico has just set up for herself as a State, and excluded all slaveholders from her borders? *These are the fruits of Taylorism.* How do the people like them?"